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#### Abstract

In the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District, course and basic skills prerequisites have been established for all courses. Students with no record of completing these prerequisites cannot enroll unless they have been assessed by a counselor, have had their prerequisites verified in alternate ways, and have been granted override status for enrollment. In spring 1989, 11,307 overrides were granted based on completion of equiva.' ent coursewrck, instructor evaluations, life experience, previous degrees, ain other reasons. A study was conducted to compare the academic success of students who had completed all course and basic skills prerequisites with that of students who had enrolied on override status, and to determine whether experience and feedback had improved the counselors' ability to appropriately place students. Study findings included the following: (1) $69 \%$ of the students who had completed all course and basic skills requirements ( $N=35,676$ ) received a grade of $A, B, C$, or Credit, compared to 64\% of those who enrolled on override status; (2) 64\% of the counselors successfully placed their students, compared with 59\% of tie counselors in spring 1989; (3) the greatest proportion of $A$ and $B$ grades was achieved by stucents with existing transcripts (58\%), students with previous degrees (44\%), and life exierience ( $41 \%$ ); and (4) stuadents who insisted on taking a course above their prerequisite level had one of the lowest success rates (49\%) and the highest course witheiawal rate (33\%). Study findings supported the conclusion that counselors who strictly enforce prerequisites, use a careful evaluation of relevant life experience, and rely on documented evidence of previous coursework can place students effectively. (VVC)
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In 1985, all courses in the SJ/ECCD had course and basic skills prerequisites as appropriate. A computerized prerequisite checking system kept track of all students who met prerequisites and all override codes given by coumselors.

The California Comminity College Matriculation Plan and title 5 regulations state that multiple assessment measures are needed in the placement of students. Counselor assessment is considered an important part of this process. This research examines the questions: (1) Does counselor assessment relate to student success? and (2) Can feedback and experience increase counselor success rates?

The success rate of $69 \%$ for all students meeting both course and basic skills prerequisites $\mathrm{CH}=24,369$, excluding override codes) for Spring 1989 was tabulated, as was the success rate of $64 \%$ for students assessed by counselors ( $\mu=11,307$ ). Success was defined as receiving a grade of A, B, C, or CR.

Codes used included: PD = Previous degree; LX = Life experienci; ET = Existing transcript; ER = Existing coursework; ES = Existing test score; IE = Instructor evaluation; OT = Old test score; $\mathrm{SE}=$ System error; $\mathrm{SI}=$ Student insistence; $\mathrm{SO}=$ Sone other reason; $S Q=$ Course to be taken in a sequence, and $S W=$ Student word.

The results were as follow;:

1. The most consistent predictor of course success over large numbers of students at $69 \%(H=35,676)$ was completion of course and basic skills prerequisites.
2. A most significant finding continues to be that counselor judgment, at its best, can relate to high success and that with feedback and experience, counselors can improve their success rates.

The overall counselor sur cess rate was 64\%, up from 59\% from Spring 1989.
Nineteen (19) of 43 (44\%) had a $60 \%$ or higher success rate, about the same as the $46 \%$ for Spring 1989.
The computer success rate was up from $65 \%$ to $69 \%$, making it more difficult for counselors to beat the computer. Eighteen percent (18\%) beat the computer for Fall 1988 and $7 \%$ for Spring 1989. If the computer success rate had remained at $65 \%$ for Spring 1989, $15 \%$ of the counselors would have beat the computer. The percent of counselors below $50 \%$ was static at $5 \%$ for Fall 1988 and $7 \%$ for Spring 1989.
3. Codes indicating the use of existing college transcripts (75\%), taking courses in proper sequence (72\%), instructor evaluation (71\%), and the use of previous degrees (64\%) were the codes associated with high success.
4. A significant inprovement in the student word (SW) override code resulted in a $61 \%$ success rate, up from $60 \%$ in Fall 1988 and $51 \%$ in Spring 1988.
5. When an so (some other reason) code was used to substitute for a prerequisite, a $56 \%$ success rate resulted.
6. The greatest proportion of $A$ and $B$ grades was achieved by students with Existing Transcripts (ET) override codes, at $58 \%$, students with Previous Degrees (PD) at $44 \%$ and Life Experience (LX), at $4,1 \%$. Students meeting all prerequisites achieved $35 \% \mathrm{~A}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ and $3^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$,
7. For students who insisted on taking a course (SI) above their assessment/prerequisite level, less than a $50 \%$ success rate ( $49 \%$ ) resulted. Only $24 \%$ received an A or 8 grade. SI students also had the highest yithdranal rates of all codes, at 33\%.

Counselors who carefully follow prerequisites, use a careful evaluation of relevant life experience, and rely on documented evidence of previous coursework can achieve high levels of success for their students.

Inservice training by counselors who have high success rates for particular override codes will ve used to help train other counselors. The hope is that focused feedback on counselor success by code will continue to result in improved student success. Further research will evaluate the results.
by
Jon Alan Kangas, Ph.D.
I. Background
A. In 1985, the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District began its Computerized Prerequisite Checking System. All courses in the district were given course and basic skills prerequisites appropriate to the course. Students who did not have a record of those prerequisites in the district's computer could see a counselor and have their prerequisites verified or established in alterrative ways. Counselors gave override codes for a particular course to explain the way in which the prerequisite had been met.
B. All California Community Colleges have begun a mandated matriculation process which includes assessment, orientations, counseling, and follow-up of students. We have been advised co use multiple means of assessment in making placement decisions rather than relying on a single test score. Counselor evaluation and judgment have been suggested as important additions to the process of assessing and placing students.
C. The current research has looked at the 11,307 override codes given at San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College during Spring 1989, the code used, the counselor who used the code, and the success of the student in the course for which he/she was given the override code.

These success rates for counselors were compared to the success rates of all students district-wide who met prerequisites ( $\underline{N}=24,369$, excluding students who received codes).
D. The goal of the project was to discern which override codes were associated with the highest anl lowest success rates and to discover which counselors had strategies for the use of codes leading to the highest levels of student success. The counselors with high success rates will be asked to share their strategies during inservice training sessions with other counselors.
E. The ciafinition of the override codes used was as ollows:

| EC | Equivalent coursework completed within the |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | District |
| EP | Experimental purposes (research, etc.) |
| ER | Discrepancy between computer/student (Er.ror) |
| ES | Existing test score, not in system |
| ET | Equivalent work seen on iranscript |
| IE | Instructor evaluated student as eligible |

LX Life experience meets prerequisites, typically judged by faculty
OT other test, e.g., old Davis score or other test score that relates to our curriculum
PD Previous degree
SE System error. Student is OK/DP not OK
SI Student insisted on taking a course above his/her assessment/prerequisite level
SM
So Some other reason. Reason noted on Program Planning form
SQ Sequence.- A technical code needed to allow a student to enroll in a course in the Summer and the following course in the Fall, e.g., English one level below 1A followed by English 1A. The SQ is given to the second class in the sequence. Student's word he/she meets prerequisite
II. Success by Override Code
A. Success for the purposes of this study was defined as a student's receiving a grade of $A, B, C$, or $C R$.

The success rate for all students in the district who met all their prerequisites (excluding those who were given override codes) was 69\%, up from $65 \%$ for Fall 1988.

The success rate associated with the various override codes ( $\mathrm{N}>10$ ) averaged $64 \%$ and ranged from $49 \%$ for sturien't insistence to $75 \%$ for students with existing trarscripts.

The following table and graph indicate the number and percentage of students who succeeded for each kind of override code given. The flat line across the graph indicates the success rate of $69 \%$ for students who met all prerequisites district-wide (excluding counselor overrides).

TABLE 1
SUCCESS RATE BY CODE

*Suce $=A+B+C+C R$ grades; the category of "no grades" was not included in the calculations
+Total of all students who met prerequisites district-wide. Includes all students who were given override codes by counselors.
-Total of all students who met prerequisites district-wide minus (-) those who had override codes.

B. Comments

4 CODES BEAT THE COMPUTER

| Success <br> Rate | Code | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 82\% | EP | This code is designed for experimental purposes. It was given in error 33 times. |
| 75\% | ET | Counselors are doing an excellent job of evaluating transcripts from other colleges to establish that students have met District prerequisites. This was up from 60\% for Fall 1988. |
| 72\% | SQ | This code was used, with a $72 \%$ success rate, up from 68\%, to allow a student to take two courses in sequence when the first is a prerequisite for the second, e.g., English one level below 1A in Summer and English 1A in the Fall. One would expect the success rate to approximate the computer's 69\% success rate, which it did. |
| 71\% | IE | Success associated with instructor evaluation, typically in the ESL and English areas, was up from 61\% for Fall 1988 to 71\%. |

5 CODES WERE AT 60\% OR HIGHER
Success
Rate
Code Comment
67\% OT Students with old Davis Test scores did quite well this year.

64\% PD 64\% (down from 69\%) of students with previous degrees succeeded at their coursework.

61\% SW Taking the "student's word" about whether they met prerequisites resulted in a 61\% success rate (up from $60 \%$ for Fall 1988 and up from 51\% in Spring 1988), indicating good judgment on the part of counselors.

60\% LX The overall success rate of $60 \%$ for the Life Experienco code was down from 69\% for Fall of 1900. This assessment was often done by faculty in areas such as electronics, laser, computer technology, and math, as well as by faculty and

$60 \% \quad$ EC $\quad$| counselors in other areas. Previous |
| :--- |
| work experience related to a given |
| course seems to be a good predictor of |
| success |$\quad$| $\frac{60 \% \text { (down from } 63 \% \text { ) of students }}{\text { succeeded who had equivalent coursework }}$to arersquisite in the district. Used <br> properly, this means the student met the <br> prerequisite by coursework within the the <br> District. Sometimes the computer may <br> not have recognized that an old course <br> was equivalent to a new one. It also <br> does not pick up repeats, which are <br> handled with an override code. |
| :--- |

1 CODF WAS BELOW 50\%

## Success <br> Rate <br> Code Comment

49\% SI Students insisting on takii:\% courses above their prerequisite level hau $1=\approx=$ than a 50\% chance of succeeding.
III. A and B Grades by Override Code
A. Students who enter a cours/s with an override code often want to be able to achiev's top grades. The following graphs, using data from "able 1, indicate the percentage of $A$ and $B$ ofsades received for each override code, excluding EP. The flat line indicates that 35\% of students who met ill course and basic skills prerequisites had $P$ or $B$ grades.
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B. Comments

ET, OT, PD, LX, and SW related to high proportions of $A$ and B grades compared to the District tetal of $35 \%$.

Students with previous college coursework who brought in transcripts had achieved 58\% A's and B's. Students with old Davi $=$ test scores had 50\%, students with previous degrees 44\%, related life experience 41\%, and student's word about previous work related to $36 \%$ A's and $B^{\prime \prime}$ s.

These students have generally had previous successful college experience.

SI, IE, ES, and SE are associated with low proportions of $A^{\prime} S$ and $B^{\prime} S$.

Only 24\% of SI students who insist on taing a course above their prerequisite level receive A's and B's.

Of interest is the fact that while instructor pvaluation (IE) results in placing students in classes with high success rates ( $75 \frac{5}{8}$ ), the number of $A^{\prime} s$ and B's by these students is quite low, at 23\%.

ES and SE codes are associated with existing test scores not yet downloaded into the computer and with system errors. T'ıese are codes associated with a certain smount of confusion and error and the meaning of the result's are not clear at his time.
IV. Withdrawal Race by Code
A. Some codes result in a much greater withdrawal rate than others.

GRAPH 3

B. Comments

Student Insistence (SI) was associated with the highest withdrawal rate, at 33\%, compared to a $20 \%$ withdrawal rate for students who met all prerequisites.

Students with Existing Transcripts (ET), Instructor Evaluation (IE) and who took courses in Sequence (SQ) had the lowest withdrawal rates, at $16 \%, 14 \%$, and 9\%, respectively.

System Error (SE), Existing Test Score (ES), and Some Other Reason (SO) were associated with confusion and with borderline cases and had high withdrawal rates, at $32 \%, 30 \%$ and $29 \%$, respectively.
V. Success Rates by Override Code and by Counselor
A. Table 2 indicates the percentage of students succeeding for each override code and for each counselor (Cl = Counselor \#1 through C48 = Counselor \#48).

Counselor

|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | c6 | c7 | C8 | C9 | C10 | C11 | C12 | C13 | C14 | C15 | c16 | c17 | c18 | 9 | c20 | c21 | c22 | c23 | c24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EC : |  | 67\% | 63\%. |  | 66\% | 0\% | 25\% | 100\% | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 20\% | 83\% | 0\% | 60\% | 42\% | 66\% | 83\% | 33\% | 70\% | 0\% | 0\% | 71\% | 68\% |
| EP |  | 83\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | \% |
| ER |  | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |
| ES | 0\% | 53\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 80\% | 25\% | 71 | 00\% | 0\% | 44\% | 0\% | 0\% | 42\% | \% | 50\% | 55\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |  |
| ET | 100\% | 59\% | 75\% | $68 \%$ | 52\% | 0\% | 67\% | 86\% | 63 | 0\% | 77x | 44\% | 50\% | 65\% | 76\% | 42\% | 64\% |  | 3\% | 100\% | 68\% |  | 00\% | 69\% |
| IE | 100\% | 59\% | 41\% | 60\% | 5 | 0\% | 27 | 100\% | 53\% | 50\% | 63\% | 0\% | 54\% | 76\% | 71\% | 5:\%! | 50\% | 100\%: | 5\% | 100\% | 66\% | 100\% | 58\% | 69\% |
| LX | 0\% | 80\% | 44\% | 0\% | 374 | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% | 73\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 67\% | 41\% | 0\% | 0\% | 55\% |  | 100\% | 0\% |  | 70\% |
| от | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% |  | \% |
| PD : | 0\% | 58\% | 67\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% |  |  | , | 0 |  | $75 \%$ | 0\% | 50\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 70\% |
| SE : | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | 0\% |  | 100\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | , 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 33\% |
| SI | 0\% | 57\% | 50\% | 67\% | 51\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | ' | 46\% | 0\% | 0\%) | 68\% | 33\% | 62\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 40\% | 0\% | 0\% | 43\% |
| SM | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | - | , |  | 0\% | , 0\%\| | 0\%. |  |  | \% | 0\% | 0\%; |  |
| so | 38\% | 51\% | 51\% | 56\% | 56\% | 0\% | 78\% | 14\% | 58\% | 0\% | 45\% | 54\% | 67\%: | 54\% | 49\% | 29\% | 88\% | 0\% | 54\% | 100\% | 59\% | \% | 57\%\| | 50\% |
| so | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\%. | 0\% | 0\% | \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$. |  | 0\% |
| SH | 25\% | 77\% | 57\% | 54\% | 64\% | 100\% | 0\% | 66\% | 4i\% | 0\% | 67\% |  | 100\% | 71\% | 53\% | 42\% | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 43\% | 73\% | 0\% |  | 64\% |
| T | 44\%. | . $61 \%$ | 51\% | 59\% | 57\% | 50\% | 56\% | 66\% | 54" | 50\% | 61\% | 45\% | 65\% | 65\% | 59\% | 46\% | 63\%' | 90\% | 60\% | 63\% | 59\% | 100\% | 58\% | 65\% |

Counselor



| 100\% | 0\% | 71\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 71\% | 58\% | 63\% | 57\% | 0\% | 92\% |  | 100\% | 100\%. | 0\% | 0\% |  | 67\% | 0\% | 61\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% | 0\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 40\% | \% | 0\% | 0\%', | 0\% | 0\% | 0\%. | 0\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| 53\% | 0\% | 53\% | 60\% | 52\% | \% | 32\% | 0\% | 48\% | 33\% | 26\% | 0\% | 100\% | 38\% | 80\% | 40\% | 25\% | 75\% | 67\% | 0\% | 67\% | 0\% | 56\% | 20\% |
| SM : 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\%. | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% |
| 62\% | 0\% | 48\% | 58\% | 57\% | 100\% | 64\% | 74\% | 78\% | 61\% | 47\% | 70\% | 67\% | 41\% | 42\% | 54\% | 60\% | 53\% | 64\% | 55\% | 62\% | 92\% | 50\% | 40\% |
| SO : ${ }^{\text {l }}$ \% | 0\% | 86\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 75\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 82\% | 83\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| W : 83\% | 0\% | 55\% | 40\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 61\% | 58\% | 54\% | 00\% | 67\% | 57\% | 75\% | 81\% | 59\% | 46\% | 36\% | 0\%. | 69\% | 0\% | 45\% | 65\% |


B. Graph 4 plots the success rates for students receiving 'SO' codes, broken down by counse: ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Counselors who did not use the code more than 30 times were not included.

GRAPH 4
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C. Graph 5 plots the suncess rates for students receiving
' 3 W ' codes, broken down by courselor. Counselors who did not use the code more than $\div$ times were not included.

## GRAPH 5
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Counselor Number
D. Graph 6 plots the success rates for students receiving 'ES' codes, brok̀en down by counselor. Counselors who did not use the code more than 10 times were not included.

GRAPH 6
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E. Graph 7 plots the overall success rates for students receiving override codes, broken down by counselor. Counselors who did not use codes more than 10 times were not included.

GRAPH 7
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Counselox Number
F. Comments

ES Code: The range of success for counselors using ES (an existing test score was seen that should allow the student to qualify for the course) was from $27 \%$ to $69 \%$, down from $53 \%$ to $73 \%$ for Fall 1988.
---None of the counselors achieved a higher success rate than the $69 \%$ rate for students meeting all prerequisites.
---One of 10 counselors (10\%) achieved a rate at or above 60\%, lower than the $20 \%$ for Fall 1988.
---Six of 10 counselors (60\%) achieved a rate below 50\%.

The use of this code relies on a solid knowledge of prerequisites and a solid interpretation of test scores. It has historically had the greatest confusion of any code used and continues to be a problem area.

So code: The success for counselors using the so code (the student meets a prerequisite for some other reason) ranged from $41 \%$ to $92 \%$, up from the $24 \%$ to 82\% associated with Fall 1988.
---Four of 34 counselors (12\%) had higher success rates than the students who met all prerequisites (69\%). This was down from the 18\% for Fall 1988.
---Eleven of 34 counselors (32\%) were at or above $60 \%$, up from $27 \%$ for Fall 1988.
---Six of 34 counselors (18\%) achieved a rate below 50\%, doing less well than the $12 \%$ for Fall 1988. This code has a greater number of low success rates than most other codes.

It is clear that a careful examination of the reasons why a student may meet a prerequisite not included in the computer's information files or program can result in success rates higher than for students who meet all prerequisites for their courses.

SW code: The range of success for counselors using the SW code (student word that they had the equivalent of a prerequisite course elsewhere) was from $36 \%$ to $83 \%$.
---Six counselors of 25 (24\%) nad success rates higher than the $69 \%$ rate of students who met prerequisites.
---Thirteen (13) of 25 counselors (52\%) were at or above 60\%, up from $47 \%$ for Fall 1988.
---Five of 25 counselors (20\%) using more than ten SW codes had a success rate below 50\%, more than the $7 \%$ for Fall 1988.

A student's word was not particularly a good predictor of success in Spring 1988. For Fall 1988, however, there was a much more thoughtful application of this code by counselors, increasing this success rate to an exceptional $60 \%$ overall. At 61\% for Spring 1989, this code has been a surprisingly good one.

Overall Counselor Success Rates: The overall success rate of counselors who used more than 10 codes ranged from 44\% to 99\%. The collective success rate increased slightly, from 57\% in Spring 1988 to 59:5 in Fall 1988 and to 64\% in Spring 1989.
-- For three of 43 counselors (7\%), their overall success rate exceeded the 69\% success rate of students who had met all prerequisites.
---Nineteen of 43 (44\%) with more than ten codes were at or above $60 \%$ overall, similar to the 46\% for Fall 1988.
---Three of 43 (7\%) had an overall success rate below 50\%. This rate was similar to Fall 1988 (5\%).
---The 99\% was associated with a very short term program in which all students received A grades.

SI code (a new code for Fall 1988): The range of success for counselors using the SI code was from $26 \%$ to 68\%.
-- No counselor using SI exceeded the $69 \%$ rate of students who met prerequisites.
---Four of 20 counselors (20\%) had success rates at or above $60 \%$.
---Nine of 20 counselors, or $45 \%$, had success rates lower than 50\%.

General Comments: Several codes and their success rates were singled out for review over time. It was gratifying and encouraging to note that the percantage of counselors with a success rate above $60 \%$ increased or remained stable for two codes as summarized below:
$\%$ of Counselors Above a $60 \%$ Success Rate

|  | $\underline{S P 88}$ | F88 | SP89 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Overall | $32 \%$ |  | $46 \%$ |
| SW | $25 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $52 \%$ |

Several codes needing improvement were represented in the percentage of counselors with success rates below $50 \%$ as summarized below:
\% of Counselors Below a $50 \%$ Success Rat'a
$\underline{S P 88} \quad \underline{\text { SP88 }}$

| Overall | $15 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ES | $43 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| SO | $33 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| SW | $50 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

How does counselor judgment as a means of assessment relate to student success? Counselors work with an infinite variety of information combinations, including test scores, previous college coursework in and outside of the district, previous degree status, high school grades, work experience, appearance, ability to articulate, vocabulary level, student's word about educational accomplishments, survey information, college grades, home situation, number of hours of work, personal support systems, perceived motivation, clarity of student goal, and so on. Every student brings a different configurations and combinations of the above kinds of information. Counselors are faced with the extraordinary task of taking each new combination of information, weighting the information, and making a unique judgment about the chances of success for each student. This judgment must then be combined with a discussion with the student to arrive at a decision about what to do. Student variables then get mixed with counselor judgment. Thís study looked at the success rate of this process in comparison to the success rate of all students in the district who met all course and basic skills prerequisites. Counselor judgment resulting in the use of override codes is often exercised in adverse circumstances, including off-campus sites, short appointment times, long lines, and inadequate information from the student.

Since this first report was done for Spring of 1988, counselors have had feedback on their performance on the use of codes. It was important to know whether or not feedback and experience could influence counselor success rates.

Documented completion of previous coursework or degrees (PD, EC and ET), along with life experience, in related work areas and instructor evaluations (LX and IE), continued to be the best ways of predicting success. When these variables were analyzed by counselors and faculty, their success rates were:

|  | SP88 | F88 | SP89 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | $60 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| Existing Transcript | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Sequence | N/A | $68 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Instructor Evaluation | $59 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Previous Degree | $59 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Student's Word | $51 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Life Experience | $67 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Existing Coursework | $60 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $60 \%$ |

The most consistent overall predictor of success in courses, 69\%, was completion of course and basic skills prerequisites within the District. Basic skills prerequisites in this study were met either by completion of basic skills courses or by an appropriate test score. Sixty-nine percent (69\%) of these students were successful.

When unique combinations of information had to be combined to establish some other reason that a student met a prerequisite (and, therefore, should be allowed in a class), the success rate for all counselors was:

## Some Other Reason

A stuciont insistence (SI) code was used for the first time in Fall 1988 for students who insisted on taking a course above their prereçuisite level. This group had one of the lowest success ra'es at 49\%.

SI students had the highest withdrawal rate of any group, at $33 \%$.

The overall success of all counselors for all codes increased from 57\% in spring 1988 to $59 \%$ in Fall 1988 and to 64\% in Spring 1989.

Again, counselor judgment is exercised along with student judgment and it is the result of this interchange that results in the override code given. It is evident that one cannot generalize about the effectiveness of counselor assessment. The judgment and counseling skills in relationship to students are exercised more effectively by some than others.

The complexity of the decision making riealing with an incredible range of variables in differing combinations for each student can never be encompassed effectively by a test or tests.

However, counselors who carefully follow prerequisites, use a careful evaluation of relevant life experience, and rely on documonted evidence of previous coursework can achieve high levels of success at $60 \%$ or above.

All in all, there is great potential for the role of counselors in the assessment process and for feedback, coupled with practice, to increase success rates. There also appears to be the real possibility that with direct feedback to a counselor about his or her success rates, the counselor's success rate can be increased. It is hoped that continual monitoring will see this trerd continue.
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